UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,000	10/14/2003	Nick Scott Russell	IDF 2420 (4000-13300)	4770

28003 7590 03/20/2007

SPRINT
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY
KSOPHT0101-Z2100
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER	
CAO, PHUONG THAO	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/685,000	RUSSELL, NICK SCOTT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phuong-Thao Cao	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 December 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Amendment filed on 12/19/2006.

2. Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 13, 16 and 21 have been amended. Currently, claims 1-22 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments regarding newly added claim limitations with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Note that the process of accessing a particular queue on a particular firewall host system must include selecting a host (e.g., using the graphical user interface associated to the particular firewall host system) as broadly claimed in the previous amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claim 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Couch et al. (Publication No US 2003/0126109).

As to claim 13, Couch et al. teach:

"A method for viewing messaging service messages" (see [0033] and [0057]), comprising:

"selecting a host computer implementing the messaging service by inputting a host computer identification" (see [0030]-[0036] and [0053]-[0054] wherein client computer system using table function to access messages from a particular queue (for instance, message queue 30 on the computer system 10c); since the system network including many computer systems each manages many message queues [0054], specifying a specific location of the desired queue to access the desired queue in the network is equivalent to identify a computer system and identify a queue of that computer system);

"selecting a queue supported by the messaging service by inputting a queue identification" (see [0053], [0054] and Fig. 6 wherein Location of the desired message queue used to identify and access the queue is equivalent to Applicant's "queue identification");

"reading a message originating from a first application and directed to a second application from the queue by a third application" (see [0031]-[0033] and [0037] wherein table function building application is equivalent to Applicant's "third application"); and

"displaying full contents of the message using the third application" (see [0057], [0004]).

As to claim 14, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Couch et al. teach:

"wherein the message includes a plurality of attributes" (see [0004]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 4-12 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landfield et al. (US Patent No 5,928,333) in view of Couch et al. (Publication No US 2003/0126109).

As to claim 1, Landfield et al. teaches:

"A system for managing messages on a queue" (see Abstract, [column 2, lines 20-32] and [column 5, lines 35-45]), comprising:

"one or more first systems operable to send a plurality of messages directed to one or more second system" (see [column 1, lines 20-30], [column 2, lines 50-60] and [column 3, lines 1-3] wherein electronic mail message is sent from one computer to another);

"a messaging service system for providing the plurality of messages to the second systems through the queue" (see [column 3, lines 35-40] and [column 5, lines 20-33] wherein

send mail process on each firewall host system as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant's "messaging service system"); and

"a computer system for managing messages on the queue by executing a first module and a second module" (see [column 2, lines 10-30] and [column 5, lines 35-50] wherein the computer implementing the electronic mail management system is equivalent to Applicant's "computer system"):

"wherein the first module is operable to read the plurality of messages from the queue that are not directed to the first module" (see [column 5, lines 40-50] wherein the disclosure of displaying information about each message indicates that message must be read before its information is displayed; also see [column 5, lines 65-67] wherein to save messages must include to read messages); and

"a second module operable to display the plurality of messages read from the queue" (see [column 5, lines 40-55] and Fig. 3A).

Landfield et al. does not teach:

"wherein the first module is selectable in a mutually exclusive manner between destructively reading the messages from the queue and non-destructively reading the message from the queue".

Couch et al. teaches:

"wherein the first module is selectable in a mutually exclusive manner between destructively reading the messages from the queue and non-destructively reading the message from the queue" (see [0009], [0033], [0038] and [0048]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Landfield et al. by the teaching of Couch et al. to add the function of selecting between destructively reading and non-destructively reading since this function provides an effective and flexible way to manage messages in the queue.

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. as modified teaches:

"wherein the computer system further executes a control module operable to perform the selection of the first module to remove at least one of the plurality of messages read from the queue" (see [column 5, lines 58-61], [column 6, lines 24-30 and 65-67] and Fig. 3A).

As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. as modified teaches:

"wherein the computer system further executes a control module operable to perform the selection of the first module to remove each of the plurality of messages from the queue" (see [column 5, lines 58-61], [column 6, lines 24-30 and 65-67] and Fig. 3A).

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. as modified teaches:

"wherein each of the plurality of messages includes attributes and wherein the second module is further operable to display the attributes of each of the plurality of message" (see [column 5, lines 45-55] and Fig. 3A).

As to claim 7, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. as modified teaches:

"wherein the plurality of messages each includes attributes and wherein the second module is operable to display sectional identifiers related to the attributes of each one of the plurality of messages" (see Fig. 3A).

As to claim 8, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 7 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. as modified teaches:

"wherein each of attributes is displayed, by the second module, adjacent the sectional identifier associated with the attribute" (see Fig. 3A wherein each box in the table represent a sectional identifier as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 9, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 6 and is similar rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. as modified teach the inclusion and display of some of attributes but does not teach the inclusion and display of all of attributes as recited in Applicant's claim language.

However, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Landfield et al. to include and display all the attributes as claimed, since decisions for including and displaying any specific attributes are choices of implementation and depend on system and user requirements of a specific application.

As to claim 10, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. as modified teaches:

"wherein each of the plurality of message includes a properties attribute and wherein the second module is operable to display only a portion of the properties attribute" (see [column 5, lines 45-55] and Fig. 3A wherein displayed information for each message only shows a portion of properties included in header of the message wherein header of the message is equivalent to Applicant's "properties attribute").

As to claim 11, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. as modified teaches:

"wherein the second module is further operable, in response to selecting the displayed portion of the properties attribute, to display in a viewer the complete properties attribute for viewing" (see [column 7, lines 3-10] wherein header information is equivalent to Applicant's "complete properties attribute").

As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. as modified teaches:

"wherein the second module is further operable to display an identifier associated with the each of the message and a delivery time related to the time the message was delivered to the messaging service" (see [column 5, lines 45-55] and Fig. 3A wherein "Queue ID" is equivalent to Applicant's "identifier", and "Queue Time" is equivalent to Applicant's "delivery time").

As to claim 21, Landfield et al. teach:

"A method of testing an application which generates messaging service messages" (see Abstract), comprising:

"running the test application" (see [column 5, lines 20-40] wherein any mail application can be a test application);

"generating a message by the test application to be sent to a second application" (see [column 5, lines 20-55] wherein mail application which sends a mail message is equivalent to Applicant's "test application" and mail application which receives the mail message is equivalent to Applicant's "second application");

"posting the message to a queue" (see [column 5, lines 25-30]); and

"reading the message from the queue with the third application to verify whether the test application is operating properly" (see [column 7, lines 3-10]).

Landfield et al. does not teach:

"inputting an identification of a host computer system maintaining the queue using a third application";

"inputting an identification of the queue using the third application";

"selecting between destructively reading the message from the queue and non-destructively reading the message from the queue"; and

"reading the message from the queue with the third application in accordance with the selection".

Couch et al. teaches:

"inputting an identification of a host computer system maintaining the queue using a third application" (see [0030]-[0036] and [0053]-[0054] wherein client computer system using table function created by the table function building application ([0037] as third application) to access messages from a particular queue (for instance, message queue 30 on the computer system 10c); since the system network including many computer systems each manages many message queues [0054], specifying a specific location of the desired queue to access the desired queue in the network is equivalent to identify a computer system and identify a queue of that computer system);

"inputting an identification of the queue using the third application" (see [0053], [0054] and Fig. 6 wherein Location of the desired message queue used to identify and access the queue is equivalent to Applicant's "queue identification");

"selecting between destructively reading the message from the queue and non-destructively reading the message from the queue" (see [0048]); and

"reading the message from the queue with the third application in accordance with the selection" (see [0033] and [0048]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Landfield et al. by the teaching of Couch et al. to add the features of inputting an identification of a host computer system maintaining the queue, inputting an identification of the queue, selecting between destructively reading and non-destructively reading and reading the message in accordance with the selection since these features provides an effective and flexible way to manage messages in a queue in a network including many computer systems wherein each computer system including many queues.

8. Claims 2-3 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landfield et al. (US Patent No 5,928,333) in view of Couch et al. (Publication No US 2003/0126109) as applied to claim 1 and 21 above, and further in view of Robinson (Publication No US 2003/0115366).

As to claim 2, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. and Couch et al. do not teach "wherein the queue is supported by a java messaging service".

Robinson teaches "wherein the queue is supported by a java messaging service" (see [0003], [0014] and [0015]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Landfield et al. and Couch et al. by the teaching of Robinson, since implementing a queue supported by java messaging service allows a convenient and flexible way to asynchronously deliver messages because java messaging service is an asynchronous messaging system.

As to claim 3, these claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 2, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. as modified do not teach "wherein the queue is on a java messaging service message server".

Robinson teaches "wherein the queue is on a java messaging service message server" (see [0015]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Landfield et al. as modified by the teaching of Robinson, since implementing a queue on a java messaging service message server allows an effective way to asynchronously deliver messages because java messaging service message server is an asynchronous messaging server.

As to claim 22, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 21 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. and Couch et al. teach "displaying attributes of the message with the third application" (see [column 5, lines 35-45] and Fig. 3A wherein the electronic mail management program is equivalent to Applicant's "third application").

Landfield et al. and Couch et al. do not teach "wherein the queue is supported by a java messaging service".

Robinson teaches "wherein the queue is supported by a java messaging service" (see [0003], [0014] and [0015]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Landfield et al. and Couch et al. by the teaching of Robinson, since implementing a queue supported by java messaging service allows a convenient and flexible way to asynchronously deliver messages because java messaging service is an asynchronous messaging system.

9. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Couch et al. (Publication No US 2003/0126109) as applied to claims 13 and 14 above, and further in view of Robinson (Publication No US 2003/0115366).

As to claim 15, these claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Couch et al. does not teach "wherein the queue is on a java messaging service message server".

Robinson teaches "wherein the queue is on a java messaging service message server" (see [0015]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Couch et al. by the teaching of Robinson, since implementing a queue on a java messaging service message server allows an effective way to asynchronously deliver messages because java messaging service message server is an asynchronous messaging server.

As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Couch et al. does not teach "selecting a profile identifying the host computer and having information to connect to the host computer, the profile further identifying the queue"; "logging on the host computer using the profile", and "connecting to the queue using the profile".

Robinson teaches:

"selecting a profile of the host computer having the host computer identification to connect to the host computer, the profile further having the queue identification" (see [0017]-[0019] and [0029] wherein connection factory encapsulating connection configuration information is equivalent to Applicant's "profile");

"logging to the host computer using the profile" (see [0017]-[0019] wherein open communication channel between an application and the messaging system is equivalent to logging as illustrated in Applicant's claim language); and

"connecting to the queue using the profile" (see [0017]-[0019] wherein connection factory is equivalent to Applicant's "profile" and the disclosure of using the connection factory to create a connection to a queue is equivalent to Applicant's claim language).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Couch et al. by the teaching of Robinson, since using profile to connect and log in the computer system and its resources (such as queue) provides effective and efficient way to access to the systems and resource as well as allows better control over resource accesses.

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 16 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Couch et al. as modified teaches:

"selecting a consume control determining whether to consume the messages after the message is read" (see [0048] wherein READ or RECEIVE are example of consume control); and

"consuming the message when the consume control has been selected to consume the message" (see [0033] and [0048]).

10. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Couch et al. (Publication No US 2003/0126109) in view of Robinson (Publication No US 2003/0115366) as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Landfield et al. (US Patent No 5,928,333).

As to claim 18, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 17 and is similarly rejected including the following: .

Couch et al. and Robinson do not teach:

"displaying attribute headings including indicia identifying attributes of the message";

"displaying each of the attributes of the message adjacent one of the associated attribute headings".

Landfield et al. teaches:

"displaying attribute headings including indicia identifying attributes of the message" (see Fig. 3A wherein column headings is equivalent to Applicant's "attribute headings");

"displaying each of the attributes of the message adjacent one of the associated attribute headings" (see Fig. 3A).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Couch et al. and Robinson by the teaching of Landfield et al. to add the features of displaying attribute headings including indicia identifying attributes of the message and displaying each of the attributes of the message adjacent one of the associated attribute headings since these features provide an effective view of messages in a queue.

As to claim 19, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Couch et al. and Robinson do not teach:

"displaying a portion of a properties attribute of the message";

"selecting the properties attribute"; and

"displaying the properties attribute in a viewer operable to view an entire text of the properties attribute of the message".

Landfield et al. teaches:

"displaying a portion of a properties attribute of the message" (see Fig. 3A wherein displayed information related to each message represents a portion of header of the message wherein header of the message is equivalent to Applicant's "properties attribute";

"selecting the properties attribute" (see [column 7, lines 3-10] for selecting headers button); and

"displaying the properties attribute in a viewer operable to view an entire text of the properties attribute of the message" (see [column 7, lines 3-10] wherein header information represents an entire text of the header of the message wherein header of the message is equivalent to Applicant's "properties attribute").

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Couch et al. and Robinson by the teaching of Landfield et al. to add the features of displaying a portion of a properties attribute of the message, selecting the properties attribute and displaying the properties attribute in a viewer operable to view an entire text of the properties attribute of the message since these features provide an effective way to manage and view messages in a queue.

As to claim 20, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Couch et al. and Robinson do not teach:

"searching the message read from the queue for a string of text"; and

"identifying the message having text matching the string text".

Landfield et al. teaches:

"searching the message read from the queue for a string of text" (see [column 7, lines 34-45]); and

"identifying the message having text matching the string text" (see [column 7, lines 40-45]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Couch et al. and Robinson by the teaching of Landfield et al. to add the features of searching the message read from the queue for a string of text and identifying the message having text matching the string text since these features provide an effective way to manage and view messages in a queue.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

C. Rones

CHARLES RONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

PTC

March 13, 2007

15 March 2007